Remarks

Written Description

A. The Office Action of page 3 rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-12, 14, 16-18, and 20 for allegedly failing the written description requirement. The Office Action alleged that reference to XOR inhibitors was "indistinct." Without acquiescing to the merits of this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the features of claim 6 and claim 7 to recite the features of claim 15. Claims 6 and 15 have accordingly been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Applicants note that claims 6 and 15 were not included in this written description rejection. Accordingly, Applicants believe that in light of the amendments the basis for this rejection has been overcome.

B. The Office Action of page 5 rejected claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-18, and 20 for allegedly failing the written description requirement. The Office Action alleged that recitation of glutathione precursors was indistinct.

Applicants note that only claims 6 and 15 recited gluathione precursors in the prior version of the claims. Applicants note that glutathione is a composition of three amino acids, and, as such, the precursors are well known in the art. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended the claims to better capture the envisioned commercial embodiments and assert that the amendments to the claims render moot the rejection.

Anticipation

The Office Action of page 8 rejected claims 1-3, 5-12, 14-18, 20, and 21 for allegedly being anticipated under 35 USC § 102(b) by Chabot.

Chabot describes treating acute lung injury with allopurinol. The Office Action on page 8 alleges that allopurinol is a known xanthine oxidoreductase inhibitor. The Office Action on

page 9 further alleges that Chabot inherently teaches treating inflammation involving leukocytes and leukocyte precursors by targeting XOR activity.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The claimed invention, as amended, is directed at selecting for and particularly targeting aberrant XOR activity in leukocytes and leukocyte precursor cells to stem particular types of inflammation. Chabot, on the other hand, simply describes treating reactive oxygen species generated in acute lung injury and accordingly is only a superficial guide to one skilled in the art at managing inflammation of the lung. Chabot does not disclose selecting for increased XOR activity in leukocytes and leukocyte precursor cells. Moreover, Chabot is completely silent with regard to XOR activity in leukocytes and leukocyte precursors in inflammation. Accordingly, Chabot does not disclose every feature of the claimed invention, and therefore cannot anticipate the claimed invention.

Should the Examiner believe that further discussion of any remaining issues would advance the prosecution, he or she is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 22, 2010

By /Zachary Derbyshire/

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Customer Number: 09629
Telephone: (202) 739-3000
Facsimile: (202) 739-3001

Zachary E. Derbyshire
Registration No. 64,669